

Rebecca Gould

## Anticolonial Insurgency in the Caucasus

This adapted excerpt is from Rebecca Ruth Gould's book *Writers and Rebels: The Literatures of Insurgency in the Caucasus* (Yale University Press, 2016), winner of the University of Southern California Book Prize in Literary and Cultural Studies and the best book of the year award from the Association for Women in Slavic Studies. This groundbreaking contribution to the study of anticolonial resistance focuses on resistance to Russian colonial rule among Chechens and other peoples of the Caucasus after the surrender of Imam Shamil. Gould's concept of "transgressive sanctity" is introduced here as a principle structuring anticolonial resistance in the Caucasus during both the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries.

Bringing the literatures of Daghestan, Chechnya, and Georgia into comparison for the first time in English, *Writers and Rebels* "finds a common aesthetic vector of insurgency pointing from the mid-19th century to the Soviet period and beyond."<sup>1</sup> The two excerpts from this work selected here for inclusion in this special issue (and slightly adapted from the version that appeared in book form) focus on the nineteenth century resistance to Russian colonial rule in the Northern Caucasus. The first excerpt is taken from the introduction and introduces the book's core concept, transgressive sanctity, through the figure of the famed guerilla warrior Imam Shamil (1797-1871). The second excerpt turns to lesser-known Chechen leaders of the anticolonial resistance to Russian rule, and explores the differences between Daghestani and Chechen traditions.

Before entering into this narrative, it will be useful for the reader to bear in mind the broader social and historical context of resistance to colonial rule in the Caucasus. As a civilizational crossroads, the Caucasus has a long

history of conflict with major world empires, and the confrontation between Russian imperial armies and indigenous inhabitants of Chechnya and Daghestan was in many respects just one more chapter in a long history of resistance. The conflict was also however different in many respects, including in the number of casualties occasioned by the conflict, which resulted in some cases in the annihilation of entire ethnicities (mostly in the Northwest Caucasus).

Rightly sensing the dangers posed by the Russian attempt to annex the north Caucasus by force, the anticolonial Daghestan leader Shamil founded his own imamate, encompassing the territories of Chechnya and Daghestan.

For a quarter of a century—from 1834 to 1859, longer than any other anticolonial Muslim state during the nineteenth century—Shamil successfully resisted the annexation of his homeland to the Russian Empire. Ultimately, however, he was forced into a position where surrendering was his only option. The excerpts below narrate the strategies that were used to resist Russian incursions prior to Shamil's surrender. They explore the very different tactics of anticolonial resistance used by Chechens as compared to Daghestanis, alongside the different Islamic legal and Sufi traditions that inspired them.



Figure 1. Imam Shamil in old age.

### Introducing Transgressive Sanctity

Although he surrendered after a quarter century of leading the peoples of Chechnya and Daghestan in their resistance to imperial rule, Imam Shamil (figure 1) has never lost his preeminent position in the Caucasus literatures of anticolonial insurgency. Among his many accomplishments, Shamil's small Islamic state successfully withstood incorporation into a colonial empire from 1834 to 1859, longer than any of its counterparts across the Islamic world. A brief reflection on the biography of this individual and the methods through which he asserted his power helps set the stage for the vacuum in political authority that ensued following the destruction of his imamate and that laid the groundwork for the literatures of anticolonial insurgency with which this chapter is concerned.

Born in 1797 in the village of Gimri in mountainous Daghestan, Shamil's original name was 'Alī. During a childhood illness, 'Alī was renamed Shāmwil. Shāmwil was later simplified to Shamil, the name by which he is known to history (with Shāmwil still retained in Arabic manuscripts). A weak child from birth, Shamil grew up to be strong, courageous, and widely esteemed for his eloquence and learning. By the age of twenty, Shamil had mastered all the traditional subjects taught in local madrasas: Arabic grammar and rhetoric (*balāgha*), jurisprudence (*fiqh*), and theology (*kalām*). Shamil received his initial training from Ghāzī Muhammad, the first imam of Chechnya and Daghestan.

In 1832, soon after obtaining permission to wage jihad against the Russians, his teacher Ghāzī Muhammad was killed by the Russians. Ghāzī Muhammad was succeeded by Hamza Bek, who himself was killed two years later by his own followers. This opened the path to Shamil, who in 1834 was chosen by the

scholars of Daghestan to lead a united Daghestan and Chechnya against the Tsarist army and simultaneously to serve as head of a Northeastern Caucasus imamate. Through such rapid transfers of power, Shamil became the third imam of the Caucasus. Shamil's historian Muhammad Tāhir al-Qarākhī



Figure 2. Manuscript from the library of Imam Shamil, Yahuda Collection, Princeton University Library. The above text opens with the statement: "Imam Shamil had given this book as the mortmain property to his male descendants so that they could benefit from it from one generation to the next." (Photograph and caption provided by Magomed Gizbulaev)



Figure 3. Manuscript from the library of Imam Shamil, Yahuda Collection, Princeton University Library. The book is Sheikh Abū Bakr 'Abdullah b. 'Abdullah b. Hussein's *Kitāb al-'Ilām fī mabāni al-Islāmi*. (Photograph and caption provided by Magomed Gizbulaev)

describes his rise to power in eulogistic terms. Al-Qarākhī writes of how the “able scholar Shamil” was so “famed in the east and the west for his jihad that the people of Mecca and Medina, the scholars of Balkh and Bukhara, and pious people from all over the world . . . prayed for his victory, success, and prosperity.”<sup>2</sup> Shamil cultivated a rich library which represented the breadth of his learning (figures 2 and 3). Scholars in Shamil’s service drew on Islamic law to mount a critique of both the colonial infidels (*kuffār*) and the ignorant (*jāhili*), not-fully-Islamicized mountaineers of Daghestan (figure 4) and, especially, Chechnya.<sup>3</sup> Partly for this reason, Shamil’s imamate marked a turning point in the political foundations of governance in the Islamic Caucasus.

More than a military leader, Shamil was the architect of a new state. In addition to adapting *sharī’a* to his local environment, the third imam formulated ordinances for situations *sharī’a* had yet to address. His second set of regulations resulted in a body of law he called *nizām*, which was modeled on *qānūn*, the legal system prevalent in the Ottoman Empire.<sup>4</sup> In formulating his legal system, Shamil introduced innovations that went beyond both indigenous law (*‘ādāt*) and *sharī’a* as traditionally understood. For example, whereas *‘ādāt* prescribed fines for thieves and *sharī’a* prescribed amputation, Shamil prescribed imprisonment and, if the offense was repeated, execution.<sup>5</sup>

Alongside his role as a lawmaker, Shamil was the leading diplomat in his self-built state. In his official correspondence, he applied to himself the term *amīr al-mu’minīn* (commander of the faithful), generally reserved for the caliph, alongside more pedestrian titles such as *qādī* (judge).<sup>6</sup> Aside from Ottoman sultans, few Islamic leaders called themselves *amīr al-mu’minīn* in the colonial period. Most significant among the titles Shamil claimed for himself, and the title by which he continues to be remembered, is *imam*, a term that has referred to the supreme leader of the Muslim community since



Figure 4. Daghestani Man (c. 1905-15). Prokudin-Gorskii photograph collection, Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division.

the founding of Islam in the seventh century. In Sunni Islam, the imam's original function was to defend "the unity and internal peace of the Muslim community . . . against the threat posed by the claims of the opposition movements."<sup>7</sup> Although the original opposition movements threatened the internal stability of the caliphate, by the beginnings of the colonial period, the threat to the Muslim community lay elsewhere, outside the Muslim sphere. In light of the altered political landscape, the meaning and function of the imam shifted. No longer a political leader who presided over a prosperous community in its political ascendancy, the imam became someone who protected beleaguered Muslims under his domain from annihilation.

Following the collapse of Shamil's imamate and from within the vacuum of authority that followed its disappearance, the guiding concept of my book, "transgressive sanctity", was born. Stated briefly, transgressive sanctity is the process through which sanctity is made transgressive and transgression is made sacred through violence against the state. Through this process, violence is aestheticized and aesthetics is endowed with the capacity to generate violence. Beyond signifying transgression against an externally imposed legal order, the violence entailed in transgressive sanctity intervenes in local laws. While the laws transgressed within this paradigm are necessarily alien to the community that transgresses them—otherwise no ethical value would attach to their transgression—the transgressive act has the consequence of altering local legal, aesthetic, and ethical norms. Generated by legal norms that, because they have been illegitimately imposed, can be legitimately transgressed, transgressive sanctity signifies a rebellion that is sacralized in and through transgression. The contentious yet generative relation between a normative legal order and a nonnormative ethical position that is crystallized by transgressive sanctity is, I argue, a constitutive feature of colonial modernity, which is brought into relief on Caucasus borderlands.

Because the transgression entailed in transgressive sanctity is never singular, transgressive sanctity refers to a process rather than a result. First, a colonial norm is violated (for example by stealing from the colonial administration, or by interfering with the work of a colonial administrator). Second, an indigenous legal system is transformed. The violation of colonial law, together with the transformation of indigenous law, brings us to the third moment in transgressive sanctity: its reconstitution in and through literary form. Its fluid structure distinguishes transgressive sanctity from other forms of rebellion and moves it beyond the monolithic accounts of resistance that shaped prior anticolonial critiques. These earlier accounts tended to ignore

the forms of aesthetic experience through which anticolonial sentiment was locally cultivated in favor of a focus on the metropolitan currents of colonial power's circulation. Although it involves the transvaluation of religious categories, transgressive sanctity arises at the intersection of politics and aesthetics, and is crystallized in the literary imagination. This transvaluation of power traverses literary, legal, and anthropological discourse while reconfiguring each of these disciplines as self-sufficient knowledge forms.

Transgressive sanctity derives its meaning and authority from the encounter between non-hegemonic legal orders, especially colonial structures of governance, and hegemonic but non-coercive indigenous law. While indigenous law ('*ādāt*) wielded hegemony before colonialism in that its authority was (to borrow from Gramsci) secured and internalized through "the diffusion and popularization of the world view of the ruling class," this authority was gradually eviscerated by colonial rule.<sup>8</sup> Even after the authority and force of indigenous law weakened, its cultural prestige persisted in colonial contexts. At this juncture, amid the near-total victory of colonial regimes across the world from the final decades of the nineteenth century to the early decades of the twentieth, transgressive sanctity transformed literature, history, and culture.

Transgressive sanctity is generated when indigenous law is emptied of its old meaning and filled with new content. This new content asserts its power by staging violent acts against the new legal order. Transgressive sanctity differs from other kinds of violence, as well as from other kinds of sanctities, in that it thrives on performance and display. As an aesthetic way of developing ethical values, transgressive sanctity is an expression of the will. Although it has historical dimensions, transgressive sanctity does not represent historical reality. It enters the world by inverting legal norms, and shapes the course of history, but this way of seeing lives its deepest life in literature. By examining literary and historical accounts of anticolonial rebellion across multiple Caucasus literatures, *Writers and Rebels* demonstrates how and why transgressive sanctity gave anticolonial violence literary form.

Shamil was the last imam prior to the incorporation of the Northern Caucasus into the Russian Empire (a process that extended from 1859 to 1864). He was followed by Najm al-Dīn al-Huṣī (d. 1925). Although he tried to prevent the incorporation of Daghestan and Chechnya into the Soviet Union, Najm al-Dīn was himself heavily influenced by Bolshevik idioms of governance. In between the political ascendancy of these imams, whose power was underwritten by actual Islamic states, unofficial insurgents were



memorialized, honored, and, in some cases, sacralized by their communities. This group of unofficial insurgents included the Chechens Vara and Zelimkhan (discussed in chapter 1 of *Writers and Rebels*), and `Alibek Hājī and Muhammad Hājī (discussed in chapter 2). Unable to wield the power wielded by their official counterparts, these unofficial imams promulgated transgressive sanctity as the source of their legitimacy. In late Tsarist and early Soviet times, the populist sanctity that circulated around these unofficial imams contributed to an anticolonial literary culture. Unable to rule through power, these figures were compelled to rule through sanctity. The means through which these insurgents acquired their prestige is an object lesson in the process through which anticolonial resistance is sedimented into ideology, and how this ideology gives rise to anticolonial literatures.

*Writers and Rebels* examines the aestheticization of violence in the vernacular literatures of the Caucasus from the nineteenth century to the Soviet period through the framework of transgressive sanctity. Across Chechen, Daghestani, Georgian, and Russian literary modernisms, I attend to worlds that were locally imagined even when they were mediated by Russian and Soviet ideologies. It is primarily with respect to Chechen culture that I have, over the course of writing this book, developed the concept of



Figure 5. Depiction of the death of the Chechen abrek Zelimkhan Kharachoevskii (d. 1914). The caption along the top reads “Dead abrek Zelimkhan and his family.”

transgressive sanctity, which I conceive as an aesthetic consciousness that arises in vacuums of legal authority when states coercively impose their laws on unwilling populations.<sup>9</sup> Conceptually, transgressive sanctity codifies the immanent logic of anticolonial violence and reveals its continuity with the aestheticization of violence in postcolonial and post-Soviet modernity. In the context of the examples studied here, transgressive sanctity is most fully realized in the outcast-bandit figure known as the *abrek* (Chechen, *obarg*), who was variously configured, contested, appropriated, and rejected by the major figures in Caucasus literary modernity (figure 5).

Although transgressive sanctity requires the full breadth of my book for its unfolding, it can be noted by way of introduction that, in his modern iteration as an anticolonial bandit, the *abrek* epitomizes the paradoxes of transgressive sanctity as a political form. With its panache for performance, transgressive sanctity gives literary life to tensions between anticolonial actors (including authors and their readers) and the agents of colonial rule. By engaging with transgressive sanctity's unfolding across the Caucasus from the late nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century, this book advances our understanding of the aestheticization of violence by the anticolonial imagination. I engage with the critical theorist Walter Benjamin, most explicitly in concluding, as I propose a critique of violence that is not merely negative. This critique takes seriously the power that is intrinsic to, and legitimated by, the aesthetics of transgressive sanctity.

Given its focus on transgressions by individuals rather than collective rebellions against states, transgressive sanctity diverges from many key contributions to political anthropology, including James C. Scott's focus on the "hidden transcripts" of subaltern groups and Pierre Clastres's account of how "primitive societies" resist governmentality.<sup>10</sup> Also, unlike much political anthropology, beyond being concerned with the dynamics of violence, transgressive sanctity is concerned with violence's cultural and aesthetic effects. It is engaged less by the *origins* of antistate violence than by the *repetition* and *performance* of that violence in cultural production. This study of the aesthetic reproduction of violence elucidates the persistent power of a political form that, because it generates and propagates suffering, needs to have its attractiveness explained. With anthropologist Steve Caton, I examine the appeal of certain forms of political life in the understanding that "force is only one aspect of the total picture in which power must be viewed."<sup>11</sup> Alongside the fear it inspires, force is also attractive from certain points of view. What Gramsci called hegemony Caton calls persuasion in



his effort to better understand the power of aesthetic representations in traditional Middle Eastern societies.

Transgressive sanctity is concerned less with the traditional questions of political science—such as why antistate actors rebel—than with the literary and aesthetic question of why and how anticolonial violence mesmerizes religious sensibilities. Such foci work in tandem, enriching and implicating each other. When we better understand violence's aesthetic, then we will also have a firmer grasp of how violence can become a viable—and often the only—modality of social existence, and of resistance, in societies ravaged by colonial and neocolonial rule. Examining the permeation of modern Caucasus literatures by violence is one way of answering Charles King's question: "why do some social conflicts appear to endure across the centuries" while other forms of violence are neutralized by popular memory?<sup>12</sup> Amid such concerns, and particularly with respect to their engagements with the perspectives of nonstate actors, Clastres's and Scott's anthropologies of resistance shed the clearest light on the sanctification of transgression when they are in dialogue with the reflexive anthropology Talal Asad on the one hand and the political aesthetics of Walter Benjamin on the other.

### Chechen Inflections to Daghestani Insurgency

Daghestani idioms of anticolonial insurgency were in constant dialogue and debate with Chechen transgressive sanctity. The life and writings of Hājji Tashaw, the teacher of the famous Chechen Sufi Kunta Hājji's teacher, offers one of the earliest testimonies to the tension between Daghestani and Chechen approaches to anticolonial insurgency. A *nā'ib* (emissary) in Shamil's service who ultimately defected for political reasons, Hājji Tashaw's conception of the forms of religiosity most appropriate to the jihad state sharply diverged from that of Shamil. As part of the "competition in religious authority" that marked the mutual interactions of these two figures, Hājji Tashaw claimed to have received an endorsement directly from the most influential sheykh in Shamil's imamate, Muhammad al-Yarāghī, to rule over Chechnya and the Northwestern Caucasus, all the way to the Black Sea.<sup>13</sup> Shamil was thereby prevented from appointing anyone in this region other than him. Ultimately, Hājji Tashaw's claim to sovereignty was undermined by the preference of the influential sheykh Jamāl al-Dīn al-Ghāzīghumūqī (d. 1866) for Shamil as imam, and the *nā'ib* was compelled to accept Shamil's supremacy in 1837.<sup>14</sup>

Yet even after his submission, Hājji Tashaw's legacy endured, as a subterranean revolt against a legalistic Daghestani discourse of insurgency and as an idiom of transgressive sanctity that entered the world following Shamil's surrender and the enfeeblement of *sharī'a* that was its consequence. The small amount of scholarship that exists on this figure suggests that Hājji Tashaw systematically privileged vernacular forms of religiosity over those that structured Shamil's jihad state. Anna Zaks, the only Soviet scholar to study Hājji Tashaw in depth, states that even though Hājji Tashaw was actively opposed to Tsarist rule, he dedicated most of his attention exclusively to Chechnya while neglecting the imamate that linked Chechnya with Daghestan. As for the booty obtained from conquest, Zaks states that Hājji Tashaw "divided it among those who were connected to him by virtue of their origins [*proizkhozhdeniem*]" and adds that he protested the confiscation of their land and "communal property [*obshchino-rodovaia sobstvennost*]."<sup>15</sup> As was shown in the preceding chapter, this preference for local over transregional idioms of governance, for indigenous law (*ādāt*) over *sharī'a*, and for forms of political life grounded in loyalty to the *taip* (clan), is more characteristic of Chechen transgressive sanctity than of its Daghestani counterpart, which turns to *sharī'a* to transcend vernacular political loyalties.

Among the writings of Hājji Tashaw that reveal the *nā'ib*'s divergence from Shamil is a short Arabic text titled "His Many Questions from a Faraway Place." As the title suggests, this work consists of a series of questions on mystical matters addressed to Hājji Tashaw's spiritual preceptor, Jamāl al-Dīn. "His Many Questions" demonstrates that, in addition to cultivating a vernacular over a transregional political agenda, Hājji Tashaw was also inclined, very much in keeping with the spirit of Chechen religiosity, to combine book learning with mystical experience.<sup>16</sup> In this text, Hājji Tashaw revealingly situates himself within a lineage of Sufi saints. Responding to an accusation that he considered himself the equal of the ninth-century Iranian mystic Bāyazīd (Abū Yazīd) al-Bistāmī, Hājji Tashaw boldly declares that his proximity to God is equal to that of the great Sufi, even though in other respects they cannot be compared. "By God!" states Hājji Tashaw, "I don't consider myself his equal. However, I exceed him in terms of presence [*Hadra*] to God the sublime. If [Bāyazīd] shows himself when the capacity for *hadra* is still latent within him, then he would see that I am made of the same material."<sup>17</sup>

Bāyazīd, the figure to whom Hājji Tashaw compares himself, has been credited with about five hundred sayings and ecstatic utterances (*shatahāt*),

which have earned him a preeminent place within the Naqshbandī *silsila* (spiritual genealogy/lineage).<sup>18</sup> By incorporating such revered figures into his own spiritual lineage, Hājji Tashaw demonstrated his debt to the affective dimensions of Muslim piety. This embrace of experiential knowledge did not, however, prevent Hājji Tashaw from reproaching those among his fellow mountaineers whom he felt failed to adequately uphold *shari`a*.<sup>19</sup> Rather than occupying one side of the spectrum extending from legality to spirituality, Hājji Tashaw mediated between Chechen transgressive sanctity and Daghestani legalism. Hājji Tashaw's mystical leanings ceased to inflect the imamate's political-theological landscape at the height of Shamil's power. The Chechen *nā`ib* disappeared in 1843, but his endeavors to connect anticolonial resistance to mystical experience acquired new life with the imamate's decline.<sup>20</sup>

Following in the footsteps of Hājji Tashaw, the Chechen `Alibek Hājji played a pivotal role in the 1877 rebellion that swept through Daghestan and Chechnya. Chechens were also active in most Daghestani movements to overturn Tsarist, and later Soviet, regimes. Spanning the northeastern Caucasus, these movements were either directed or heavily influenced—and, some would say, compromised—by Chechen actors. Alongside Chechens' direct participation in anticolonial resistance movements, Chechen idioms of insurgency influenced subsequent Daghestani history when Daghestanis emulated or explicitly rejected them.

When anticolonial insurgency became a factor in Daghestani history, it differed from its Chechen counterpart in several respects. First, whereas Chechen insurgency was suffused by indigenous culture and folklore, and was fully textualized only with the advent of Soviet modernity, the Daghestani encounter with colonial rule was textualized from its inception and deeply rooted in a preexisting Arabic literary tradition that dated back to the earliest centuries of Islam. Hence the greater preponderance of (nonvernacular) Arabic in the Daghestani literature of anticolonial insurgency. These divergences had implications for Daghestani and Chechen literary history. Daghestani idioms of resistance were articulated through the learned discourse of *uṣūl al-fiqh* (Islamic jurisprudence) that undergirded the legal institution of the imamate. While transgressive sanctity inflected nearly every aspect of Chechen insurgency, the Daghestani discourse pertaining to jihad was modulated by other legal norms. That, grounded as it was in rules, regulations, and codified law, Daghestan *fiqh* was also more adept than Chechen transgressive sanctity at accommodating the colonial legal order in

part accounts for Daghestan's comparatively less traumatic encounter with colonial modernity.

Across a wide array of local and foreign sources, Chechens earned a reputation as a people with a democratic ethos. For the Georgian writer Qazbegi, who was on intimate terms with the Chechen mountaineers, "Chechens have never known slavery [*batonqmoba*]," because "they consider each other equal."<sup>21</sup> A colonial source reinforces this perception with the description of Chechens as a "democratic people, with no princes, nobility, peasants, or even clerical class," for whom the kinship relations enshrined in the institution of the *taip* were paramount.<sup>22</sup> More recently, the Russian ethnologist Jan Chesnov introduced the phrase "Vainakh democracy" to describe the Chechen ethos.<sup>23</sup> According to this consensus, Chechnya is one of many highland cultures wherein "political equality, not hierarchy, [was] the vision of social relations in the tribal community."<sup>24</sup> In Daghestan, by contrast, civic ties took precedence over ties of kinship. Far from denoting common ancestry, clans in precolonial Daghestani society were "consensual groups of those who agreed to share certain legal responsibilities."<sup>25</sup> In terms of Caton's anthropology of mountaineer societies, the Chechen social order approximates to the tribal culture of highland Yemen, which emphasizes honor over piety, and the Daghestani social order approximates to the culture of the *sayyids* (descendants of the prophet), which prioritizes piety over honor.<sup>26</sup>

With greater flexibility came increased social hierarchy as well as more possibilities for maneuvering among hierarchies. Concomitantly with the extensive networks of learning that flourished throughout Daghestan, Daghestani anticolonial insurgency was inaugurated as a movement of the learned and articulated as a jurisprudential discourse before it entered popular consciousness. Chechen insurgency by contrast was articulated through the transformation of *'ādāt* norms which pertained to all members of society.

## Notes

1. Alexander E. Balistreri, "Writer, Rebel, Soldier, Shaykh: Border Crossers in the Historiography of the Modern Caucasus," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 20.2 (2019): 346. Another reviewer, Sarah Irving, argues that, "by undertaking an exercise in literary anthropology across a historical period, Gould explores how a multi-layered approach that combines a historical background, literary biography, and analyses of texts and their reception, can reveal much about ideological and normative strands in a society through the aesthetics of its cultural products and the complex interrelationship between aesthetics and the environments from which they emerge," *Postcolonial Text* 13.1 (2018).
2. Muhammad Tāhir al-Qarākhī, *Bāriqat al-suyūf al-dāghistānīyah fī ba`d al-ghazawāt al-shāmīliyah*, ed. A. M. Barabanov and I. Iu. Krachkovskii (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1946), 8.
3. See Michael Kemper, *Herrschaft, Recht und Islam in Daghestan* (Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2005), 255–404.
4. See Moshe Ganner, "The Imam and the Pasha," *MES* 32.4 (1996): 340.
5. See A. Runovskii, "Kodeks Shamilia," *Voennyi sbornik* 2 (1862): 338–339.
6. *Araboiazychnye dokumenty epokhi Shamilia*, ed. R. Sh. Sharafutdinova (Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura, 2001), documents 127, 131 (letters 67, 68).
7. See W. Madelung, "Imāma," *EI*<sup>2</sup>.
8. Thomas R. Bates, "Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 36.2 (1975): 352.
9. The first iteration of this argument appeared in Rebecca Gould, "Transgressive Sanctity," *Kritika* 8.2 (2007): 271–306, and is developed in revised form in chapter 1 of this book.
10. James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: The Hidden Transcript of Subordinate Groups* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1992); Pierre Clastres, *Archéologie de la violence: La guerre dans les sociétés primitives* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1977).
11. Steven C. Caton, "Power, Persuasion and Language," *IJMES* 19.1 (1987): 77.
12. Charles King, *Extreme Politics* (New York: Oxford UP, 2009), 4.
13. The citation in this sentence is from Kemper, *Herrschaft*, 296.
14. For these details of Hājji Tashaw's biography, see Smirnov, *Miuridizm*, 61–62.
15. A. B. Zaks, "Tashev Khadzhi," *Voprosy Istorii* 4 (1993): 144.
16. See the citation from this work in Kemper, *Herrschaft*, 299.
17. Hājji Tashaw, *As`ilatuhu al-`adid min makān al-ba`id* (IIAE, f. 14, op. 1, no. 1690), folios 5b–6a. Cited and translated in Kemper, *Herrschaft*, 298–299.
18. For a detailed study of Bāyazid, see M. `Abdur Rabb, *The Life, Thought and Historical Importance of Abu Yazid AlBistami* (Dacca: Academy for Pakistan Affairs, 1971).
19. Hājji Tashaw's desire to institute shari`a is noted in Zaks, "Tashev Khadzhi," 142, and Smirnov, *Miuridizm*, 62.
20. Zaks reports that the last recorded mention of Hājji Tashaw's activities occurs in the reports of the Caucasus regiment and that there is a local (presumably Chechen) saying that he died his "own death [*svoei smertiui*]" ("Tashev Khadzhi," 145).

21. Aleksandre Qazbegi, "Mamis mkleveli," *Txzulebata sruli krebuli ot `x tomad* (Tbilisi: Sabchota sakartvelo, 1948), 1:303.
22. Kovalevskii, *Vosstanie Chechni i Dagestana*, 10.
23. Ian Chesnov, "Byt' Chechentsem. Lichnost' i etnicheskie identifikatsii naroda," in *Rossii i Chechnia. Obschestva i gosudarstva*, ed. Dmitrii Furman (Moscow: Sakharov Foundation, 1999), 63–101.
24. Steve Caton, "'Salam Tahiya': Greetings from the Highlands of Yemen," *American Ethnologist* 13.2 (1986): 296.
25. Michael Kemper, "Communal Agreements (ittifāqāt) and `ādāt-Books from Daghestani Villages and Confederacies (18th–19th Centuries)," *Der Islam* 81.1 (2004): 124.
26. Caton, "Salam Tahiya," 292.